



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,913	01/05/2006	Paul William Manley	ON/4-32700A	6405

1095 7590 10/03/2007

NOVARTIS
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER

RAO, DEEPAK R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,913

Applicant(s)

MANLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Deepak Rao

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 ~~is/are~~ are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 ~~is/are~~ are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20050323 & 20060411.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating leukemia, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for the treatment of a disease which responds to an inhibition of protein kinase activity generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that “undue experimentation” would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

The instant claim 11 is drawn to 'a method for the treatment of a disease which responds

Art Unit: 1624

to an inhibition of protein tyrosine kinase' and the specification provides EGFR, ErbB-2, KDR, etc. as examples of the protein tyrosine kinases. The specification provides sources of certain kinases (e.g., Raf-1) and assays to test the activity of the compounds with respect to those kinases, however, does not provide any test procedures to measure the protein kinase inhibition activity in general. The specification merely recites that the compounds are useful as protein kinase inhibitors and based on the kinase inhibition activity, the specification provides that the compounds are useful in the treatment of proliferative disorders. The disclosure further provides leukemia and solid cancers, etc. as examples of proliferative disorders. The instant claim appears to be a 'reach through' claim. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions, for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification thereby requiring undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the invention.

The specification does not provide any guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art to know what is encompassed by the instant recitation of 'a disease which responds to protein kinase inhibition' activity generally. The recitation "protein kinase" encompasses all members of the protein kinase super family. The specification does not provide the sources for the various enzymes encompassed by the instant claims, e.g., VEGF, KDR, EGFR, etc. The test procedures and data provided in the specification is with respect to the *in vitro* activity of the compounds in the inhibition of Raf-1 and Abl. Applicant did not state on record or provide any guidance regarding which state of the art assays may provide basis for the instantly claimed activity of inhibition of protein tyrosine kinase generally. Further, there is no disclosure regarding how this

Art Unit: 1624

potential inhibitory activity is correlated to the clinical efficacy of the treatment of various disorders of the claims. As can be seen from specification, data related to the protein kinase inhibition holds significant role in determining the dosage regimen based on the minimal effective concentration of each of the compound to achieve the desired inhibition of the protein kinases.

The instant claims are drawn to “a method for the treatment of a disease which responds to an inhibition of protein tyrosine kinase” which diseases include, for example, proliferative disorders. First, the instant claims cover 'diseases' that are known to exist and those that may be discovered in the future, for which there is no enablement provided. The use disclosed in the specification is as protein tyrosine kinase inhibitors, in the treatment of a large list of proliferative diseases, which include leukemia, breast, gastric, ovarian, colon and prostate cancers, etc. There are no test assays and procedures provided in the specification and there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this recited activity correlates to the treatment of the diverse disorders encompassed by the instant claims. The diseases and disorders encompassed by the instant claims include various types of cancer, some of which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

See MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly

Art Unit: 1624

structure specific area, as evidenced by the wide range of results obtained for the tested compounds. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the large list of diseases embraced by the claims, which diseases respond to inhibition of protein tyrosine kinases generally. Further, there is no disclosure regarding how the patient in need of the treatment requiring the specific kinase (i.e., VEGFR, KDR, EGFR, etc.) inhibiting activity is identified and further, how all types of the diseases having divers mechanisms are treated. The state of the art is indicative of the unpredictability of the therapeutic approach based on kinase inhibiting activity. Cressey et al. (Medline Abstract 2005) state that "Although numerous publications dealing with the measurement of circulating VEGF for diagnostic and therapeutic monitoring have been published, the relationship between the production of tissue VEGF and its concentration in blood is still unclear".

According to the specification, the instant claims include 'a method for the treatment of proliferative disorders' which include various types of cancers (see pages 6-7). The terms 'cancer' and 'proliferative disorders' represent anything that is caused by abnormal tissue growth. That can be growth by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continued growth after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such term covers not only all cancers, but also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, polyps, etc. No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. For example, Yano et al. (Medline Abstract 2000) provides

Art Unit: 1624

for the treatment of malignant pleural effusion of human lung adenocarcinoma by inhibition of VEGF receptor, however, the state of the art is not indicative any pharmaceutical agents that are useful in the treatment of cancer generally. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states that “each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study” (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Also see *In re Buting*, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein 'evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of cancers'. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. In reference to cancer treatment using protein tyrosine kinase inhibitors, Traxler (Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents, 1997) stated that “pharmacological properties such as stability in biological media, bioavailability, metabolism or formulability are significant hurdles” see page 585, col. 2, lines 33-36.

The diagnosis of each of the disease is generally suggested by medical history and reports of endoscopy, cytology, X-ray, biopsy, etc. depending on the symptoms, signs and complications, which is essential to establish the dosage regimen for appropriate treatment. The disclosure does not provide any guidance towards the dosage regimen required to facilitate the treatment and/or inhibition of the claimed disorders, nor indicate competent technical references in the appropriate methods.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as

Art Unit: 1624

the instant case, “the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved”. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Traxler, in a recent article (Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents, 1997) stated that “The concept of the inhibition of growth factor receptor-mediated signal transduction via inhibition of its protein tyrosine kinase is a novel, **not yet proven** clinical approach to the regulation of cell proliferation”, see page 585, col. 1. Therefore, the state of the art provides the need of undue experimentation for the instantly claimed therapeutic benefits.

(Only a few of the claimed diseases are discussed here to make the point of an insufficient disclosure, it does not definitely mean that the other diseases meet the enablement requirements).

MPEP § 2164.01(a) states that “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)”. That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice the claimed invention.

Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, “the level of skill in the art” and “predictability”, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope

Art Unit: 1624

with the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buerger et al., WO 02/22597 (cited in IDS). The reference teaches substituted pyrimidine compounds having tyrosine kinase inhibitory activity, see the structural formula (I) in page 1, and the compounds of Examples 11, 12, etc. The instant claims include compounds wherein R₃ is alkyl, e.g., methyl. Therefore, the instantly claimed compounds differ from the reference compounds by having a methyl in place of H (or H vs. CH₃) on the terminal phenyl ring. In other words, the instantly claimed compounds differ by having a -CH₂ group and it is well established that compounds that differ by a -CH₂ group are structural homologs. It would have

Art Unit: 1624

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reference compounds to prepare the structural homolog. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally homologous compounds are expected to possess similar properties. It has been held that compounds that are structurally homologous to prior art compounds are *prima facie* obvious, absent a showing of unexpected results. *In re Hass*, 60 USPQ 544 (CCPA 1944); *In re Henze*, 85 USPQ 261 (CCPA 1950).

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 23, 2005 and April 11, 2006 and a copies are enclosed herewith.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 1624

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


**/Deepak Rao/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624**

October 1, 2007